

Report of Results of the Accreditation Stakeholder Survey

Professional Services Division

February 8, 2006

Overview

The Accreditation Stakeholder Feedback Survey will close on February 10, 2006.

The following topics will be discussed in the COA meeting:

- a. Reporting on the Results of the Accreditation Stakeholder Feedback Survey – Staff will present the summarized results of the survey.
- b. Analysis of Results – Staff will present an initial report analyzing the results of the survey.
- c. Discussion of Reporting the Results – Staff has provided a first draft of the beginning of the item for the April 2006 Commission meeting reporting on the results and the analysis.

Numbers in italics and underlined are accurate as of 2/3/06

Draft of Beginning of Commission Agenda Item

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) received recommendations for revision of the Accreditation System from the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the Accreditation Study Work Group at its October 2005 meeting. Before acting upon these recommendations, the Commission wanted to receive feedback about the recommendations from a broad spectrum of the education community. A web-based survey was developed to gather stakeholder feedback. This survey was designed to collect information from individuals. If groups (professional organizations, schools, or other groups) wished to provide feedback, a letter could be sent to the Committee on Accreditation in care of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Professional Services Division. A total of 386 individuals submitted an accreditation survey between December 6 and February 10th, 2006.

The survey was posted on the Commission's web site on December 6, 2005. Notification of the availability of the Accreditation Survey was disseminated through the CCTC's E-news listserve on December 6, 2005. A second notice was sent through the listserve on February 1, 2006 to remind interested individuals that the survey window closed February 10, 2006. All members of the Committee on Accreditation and the Accreditation Study Work Group were asked to notify their stakeholder groups of the survey and the Commission's desire to receive feedback on the recommendations regarding the revision of the Accreditation System. In addition, an email was sent to all members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) notifying them about the review of the accreditation system, the recommendations, and the survey. BTSA Induction programs work with first and second year teachers in almost all districts in California. Directors of BTSA Induction programs were introduced to the recommendations from the COA and Accreditation Study Work Group and the survey during their January 2006 cluster meetings.

The web survey collected demographic information from each respondent (Part A). Feedback was desired from both the K-12 community and institutions of higher education. Therefore respondents were self-categorized as either K-12, IHE or a member of the public. Within the K-12 responders, information was collected regarding the role(s) served in the schools including experience with approved educator preparation program. Similarly, from the higher education responders, demographic information was collected including which segment of higher education the individual represents, if the individual is affiliated with a school of education, and the type of education preparation program(s) the individual works with (multiple subject teacher, single subject teacher, special education, administrative services, or pupil personnel services.) Demographic information on the respondents is provided in **Appendix A**.

In addition to the demographic information, the web survey asked the individuals responding to describe prior experience(s) with accreditation in general (Part B). A series of Yes/No statements were provided. In addition, if an individual had prior experience in accreditation activities that were not listed, an opportunity existed for the individual to describe these experiences. Each accreditation activity was assigned a point value from 0 to 5 to describe the relevance of the experience to standards based accreditation of educator preparation programs.

Numbers in italics and underlined are accurate as of 2/3/06

Therefore it is possible to disaggregate the data based on prior experience with accreditation. The statements regarding prior experiences with accreditation and the points assigned are listed below:

- I have been a member of the Commission's Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) and served on one or more teams on accreditation visits for CCTC (5)
- I have served as a member of a NCATE site visit team (5)
- I have participated in the preparations for a CCTC site visit at my institution (3)
- I have been a team member for a BTSA Formal Program Review visit (4)
- I have been a team member for a WASC site visit (4)
- I have participated in the preparations for a WASC visit at a college or university (2)
- I have participated in the preparations for a WASC visit in the K-12 schools (2)
- I have participated in the preparations for a BTSA Formal Program Review visit (2)
- I have participated in another standards-based, education-related accreditation activity (1.5)
- I have participated in other standards-based, non-education related accreditation activity (1)
- I have no prior experience in standards-based accreditation activities. (0)

Therefore for each individual responder a 'total experience with accreditation activities' score was calculated. The mean score and standard deviation of the accreditation experience scores is reported in **Appendix A**.

After collecting information related to demographics and the individual's prior experience with accreditation, the web survey asked the individual to respond regarding his or her general beliefs about the accreditation of educator preparation (Part C-1). The definition of accreditation from the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary was provided for respondents: "to recognize (an educational institution) as maintaining standards that qualify the graduates for ...professional practice."

For each statement, the individual selected from five responses: '*Strongly agree*', '*Agree*', '*Neither agree nor disagree*', '*Disagree*' or '*Strongly disagree*'. The statements on general beliefs about accreditation are listed below:

Purposes and Qualities of an Accreditation System:

- 1) Accreditation should assure the public that an institution/program sponsor's programs are of an accepted minimum level of quality.
- 2) Accreditation should lead to and encourage program improvement.
- 3) One major purpose of accreditation is assuring the public that educator preparation programs adhere to and meet adopted program standards.
- 4) All educator preparation programs that lead to a credential or certificate should be reviewed and approved through the accreditation system.
- 5) Professional educators should be entrusted with evaluating the quality of educator preparation programs.

Activities of an Accreditation System:

Numbers in italics and underlined are accurate as of 2/3/06

- 6) A site visit of some kind by educational experts to the institution/program sponsor where the preparation programs are offered is an important component of an accreditation system.
- 7) An accreditation system that reviews an institution through a site visit once every six years with no additional review activities is sufficient to meet the public's need for accountability.
- 8) Those reviewing the institution should look only at the information submitted at the time of the accreditation review for the purposes of accreditation.
- 9) In order to determine the quality of a program, the reviewers should have access to previous accreditation reports about the institution and its programs, and actions taken by the institution/program sponsor.
- 10) An accreditation system should require ongoing data collection on candidate (future teacher) performance and program quality by program sponsors.
- 11) An accreditation system should require the accredited institution/program sponsor and its programs to analyze data collected and submit a summary periodically so that data could be reviewed by the accrediting body.
- 12) An accreditation system should require the demonstration that the institution and its programs use the analysis of data on an ongoing basis to guide program improvements.
- 13) Those reviewing an institution/program sponsor should have access to the ongoing data collected by the institution/program sponsor, the analysis of the data, and the program improvements that have been implemented since the previous review.

The current accreditation system includes a single accreditation decision about the institution or the educational unit and all the programs sponsored by the institution/education unit:

- 14) An accreditation system should include a review of the institution or educational unit as an educational entity.
- 15) Within an accreditation system, each program should be reviewed and the results of each program review should be available to the public.

Evaluation of the accreditation system:

- 16) An accreditation system should be systematically evaluated periodically.
- 17) Modifications to the accreditation system should be made based on data collected through the systematic evaluation process.

A response of 'Strongly agree' was assigned a score of 2, 'Agree' a 1, 'Neither agree nor disagree' a 0, 'Disagree' a -1, and 'Strongly disagree' a -2. The means and standard deviation for each of the seventeen general statements on accreditation are provided in **Appendix B**.

The seventeen statements about the accreditation of education preparation programs were developed from the consensus agreements of the COA and the Accreditation Study Work Group's work. Fifteen of the seventeen statements address the major themes integrated

Numbers in italics and underlined are accurate as of 2/3/06

throughout the recommendations. Two of the statements (# 7 and # 8) were constructed in the negative to the consensus of the group. The general statement describes the opposite of the COA and Work Group recommendation. For example, statement 7 says that ‘one site visit every six years is an adequate method to utilize in accreditation’ whereas the COA and Work Group’s recommendation is that accreditation activities should be spread across a seven year cycle. Statement 8 is that the reviewers ‘should look only at the information submitted at the time of the accreditation review’ whereas the consensus recommendation of the COA and Work Group is that reviewers should have access to the prior accreditation report and COA finding and all reports or information collected since the last accreditation visit.

The COA and Accreditation Study Work Group provided to the Commission a list of specific recommendations with background information and a rationale for the recommendation. Individuals completing the survey had the option to review and respond regarding each recommendation (Part C-2). If an individual did not choose to respond to the individual recommendations, the survey would take the individual to the final section of the survey (Part D). The final section of the survey was an open ended prompt that stated, “Please use this space to provide any additional information that you believe should be considered as the Commission reviews and revises the accreditation system.” These comments are provided in **Appendix C**.

The optional portion of the survey was the “Feedback on individual recommendations.” In this section, each individual recommendation (seventeen general recommendations although two of the recommendations has a number of sub-recommendations) was listed as it was stated in the “Preferred Option” text in the October 2005 Commission Agenda Item 6C (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2005-10/2005-10-6C.pdf>). There was also a link to the complete section of the agenda item for that recommendation (including the background information, the rationale and the discussion of the preferred option.) For each recommendation, the individual selected from five responses: ‘*Strongly support*’, ‘*Support*’, ‘*No opinion*’, ‘*Do not support*’ or ‘*Strongly do not support*’. Out the total of 386 completed surveys, 156 individuals reviewed the specific recommendations. A response of ‘*Strongly support*’ was assigned a score of 2, ‘*Support*’ a 1, ‘*No opinion*’ a 0, ‘*Do not support*’ a -1 and ‘*Strongly do not support*’ a -2. A total of 156 respondents reviewed the recommendations and provided responses. The means and standard deviations related to the specific recommendations are provided in **Appendix D**.

If an individual selected “Do not support” or “Strongly do not support,” for any of the recommendations, a text box was provided with the following prompt: “For each recommendation that you do not support or strongly do not support, you’ll be asked a follow-up question for information as to how you believe the topic should be addressed in the accreditation system.” A total of insert # here individuals provided a response to one or more of the recommendations. These comments are provided in **Appendix E**.

After reviewing the specific recommendations, the respondents were also asked to “Please check the response below that best represents your overall opinion about the proposed new accreditation system.” Responses were ‘*Strongly support*’, ‘*Support*’, ‘*No opinion*’, ‘*Do not support*’ or ‘*Strongly do not support*.’ Once again, a response of ‘*Strongly support*’ was assigned

Numbers in italics and underlined are accurate as of 2/3/06

a score of 2, 'Support' a 1, 'No opinion' a 0, 'Do not support' a -1 and 'Strongly do not support' a -2. The means and standard deviations related to the opinion of the proposed system after reviewing the recommendations is provided in **Appendix D**.

Individuals had an opportunity to provide one more open ended response, "Please indicate the changes to the proposed system that you would prefer to see implemented or explain what you support in the proposed system." Of the 156 respondents that reviewed the recommendations, a total of 20 individuals provided a response to this prompt. These comments are provided in **Appendix F**.

As was the case for individuals that did not review the individual recommendations, the final section of the survey was an open ended prompt that stated, "Please use this space to provide any additional information that you believe should be considered as the Commission reviews and revises the accreditation system." A total of 180 individuals provided a response to this prompt. These comments are provided in **Appendix C**.

Commission staff, the COA and the Accreditation Study Work Group are seeking direction from the Commission regarding

Numbers in italics and underlined are accurate as of 2/3/06